



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,993	12/06/2004	Sami Uskela	089229.00042	1328
32294 7590 02/21/2008 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 14TH FLOOR 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			EXAMINER NGUYEN, SIMON	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/21/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/516,993

Applicant(s)

USKELA, SAMI

Examiner

SIMON D. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: there are **two** "are" in "where each of the plurality of transmission means are are for communicating.....". Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lord et al. (6,763,012).

Lord discloses a packet data transmission system (figs.1-5, abstract), comprising: a plurality of transmission units (TE 1-3 fig.1), wherein each of the transmission units communicates with a network device using a single packet data context and wherein each of the plurality of transmission units has a unique IP address (column 2 lines 12-59, column 3 lines 16-62, column 4 lines 13-40, figs. 1-5).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord et al. (6,763,012).

Regarding claim 1, Lord discloses a packet data transmission network connection (abstract, fig.1), comprising: employing a packet protocol for data transmission; identifying TEs with different IP addresses (desiring to connect a plurality of devices (TE1-TE2 of fig.1, each with a unique IP addresses (figs. 1, column 4 lines 33-40, column 5 lines 35-53), wherein the participants (TE and MT with a packet context) comprising at least one TE, a mobile station with a mobile termination (fig.1); activating and associating a packet data context with all of the IP addresses, transmitting data between the TEs (column 4 lines 26-40, column 5 lines 1-60). However, Lord does not specifically disclose participants.

It should be noted that since Lord discloses the MT and a method of connecting a plurality of TEs to a PDN for a packet data communication, wherein each TE has the unique IP address, wherein the PDP context relates to the plurality of TEs, which means the TEs in the PDP context are obviously as participants.

Regarding claim 11, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1, wherein a first unit comprises a MT and a plurality of TEs, and a second unit comprises a network device (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 2, Lord discloses activating the context in the mobile station (MT performs PDP context activation procedure (step 34 of fig.3) (figs. 3, 5).

Regarding claims 3, 12, Lord discloses identifying M T and TEs with unique IP addresses (figs. 3, 5, column 5 lines 24-60).

Regarding claim 4, Lord further discloses the MT sending packet data from IP addresses using one packet context (figs. 3, 5, column 5 lines 24-60).

Regarding claim 5, Lord further discloses the MT receiving packet with more than one IP addresses and forwarding each packet to TE according to IP address (figs. 3, 5, column 5 lines 24-60).

Regarding claims 6-7, 13, Lord further discloses activating and transferring the packet context between the MT and a gateway support node (step 34 of fig.3 (fig.1, 3, column 4 lines 13-40, column 6 lines 43-48).

Regarding claim 9, Lord further discloses the MT requesting a new IP address and associating the IP address with the packet context (abstract, column 2 lines 21-39, and column 4 lines 51-67).

Regarding claims 17-18, Lord further discloses one packet data context associated with more than on IP address of a same type (abstract, column 3 lines 16-62, column 4 lines 13-40).

6. Claims 8, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord et al. (6,763,012) in view of Ravishankar et al. (US 2003/0060210 A1).

Regarding claims 8, 14, Lord fails to teach one packet context for one quality of service.

Ravishankar discloses a single packet context for a plurality of IP addresses ((pars. 40, 42-45, figs. 3b-3e), wherein each packet context for each quality of service (paras. 5, 7-8, abstract, claims 5, 14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Lord, modified by Ravishankar in order to improve the signal performance for different types of service in a packet data communication.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord et al in view of Kumaki et al. (2002/0191562).

Regarding claim 10, the modified Lord fails to teach or suggest the MS sending a request for releasing the IP address.

Kumaki discloses a MS sending a request for releasing an IP address (paragraphs 186, 552). Therefore, it would have been obviously to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lord, modified by Kumaki in order to save cost of the service when the mobile station is no longer in use.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The new cited art issued to Lord discloses a packet data context for a plurality of terminal equipments in a mobile terminal, wherein each terminal equipment comprises an unique IP address to communicate a packet data to service node in the packet data communication system.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number:  
10/516,993  
Art Unit: 2618

Page 7

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban, can be reached on (571) 272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SIMON D NGUYEN  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2618

February 15, 2008

SIMON NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

